

Page Denied

good example of this, says Prof. Roger Feldman of the University of North Carolina, is the emergence of the Oregon Physicians Service.

Prior to the establishment of OPS, the Oregon doctors had to bargain with several private, profit associations. Mr. Feldman says, "In the interest of profitmaking, the associations made serious attempts to control benefit payments to physicians and hospitals. . . . Although the cost-control feature was viewed by many practicing physicians as undesirable, associations' coverage did have the advantage of certainty of payment." At any rate, the Oregon physicians created an alternative, OPS, which eventually became a Blue Cross-Blue Shield agency. Concluded Mr. Feldman, "The emergence of OPS literally drove the associations out of the Oregon health insurance market."

In reply, Roderick Bunnell, senior vice-president of OPS says that "OPS has never driven anyone out of business and has never dominated the business." He says Mr. Feldman has used information that was applicable in the 1930s and '40s, but not today. Mr. Bunnell admits OPS costs more than the private plans, but says it has broader benefits. It has turned over a large amount of information to the FTC, which is investigating various Blue Cross plans, of which OPS is one.

The medical profession has controlled entry into the field. Last year the medical profession was successful in getting Congress to pass the 1976 Health Professions Educational Act, which, among other things, restrained entry into the United States of foreign medical school graduates. This fact becomes relevant when viewed against the trend of increasing numbers of foreign medical school graduates who come to the U.S. to practice medicine. In some years since 1965, the new foreign medical school graduates entering the country exceed the number of graduates of domestic medical schools. Medical associations defend their policies by noting that foreign medical school graduates sometimes do not enter this country as well qualified as U.S. graduates.

Even U.S. citizens are finding it more difficult to gain entry into medical schools in this country. The Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), sponsor of the medical school entrance examination, has decided to extend the exam from three hours to six hours. The longer test, combined with college records, is designed to help medical schools better evaluate which of the 60,000 students who take the test will be granted one of the 15,700 positions available.

However, the FTC is looking into the AMA's control of this process as well. For example, a doctor cannot work at most hospitals without either graduating from an AMA-accredited medical school or passing a stiff exam (not given graduates of AMA-accredited schools). Since the AMA controls the accreditation process and there is such a demand to go to medical school, the FTC is considering whether a broader, more public-oriented group should control the accreditation process.

Miss Anderson of the AMA points out that most professional accreditation boards are similar to the one that governs medical schools. The current medical school accreditation board consists of six AMA members, six AAMC members, one member of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and two individual consumers of medical services.

The FTC is investigating the "blues," that is, Blue Cross and Blue Shield, the comprehensive health and hospitalization insurance plans. Specifically, says Mr. Palmer, there is concern that the insurance plans

have come under physical control and exercise little restraint over cost. Complains Richard Shoemaker, an assistant director at the AFL-CIO, "The power lies with the doctors, who only act to stimulate demand for their own gain."

Replies Miss Anderson, "I believe Mr. Shoemaker underestimates the sophistication of the consuming public. The public knows more about what it wants than he thinks. Also I believe he doesn't have any conception of how a doctor must gain information. It is easy to sit on the sidelines and complain, but it's harder when people's health is at stake."

The extensive screening and anti-competitive processes seem ironic when contrasted with other aspects of the medical society. For example, once licensed, in many states the physicians are not re-examined.

Finally, concludes Professor Feldman, hospitals are expected to regulate the quality of physicians in their corridors. But, asks the professor, "Who regulates the hospitals?" This question is the subject of another FTC investigation.

HON. JIM LLOYD

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LLOYD of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following letter to the editor which appeared in the June 22, 1977, Washington Star. Before voting to prohibit "double dip-pers" when considering defense appro-priations, I would suggest that we con-sider commitments made to servicemen 20 years ago:

Although as a retired naval officer I am not the most detached of observers on the question of retired officer employment and compensation, I can speak with personal knowledge of some aspects of retired officerhood which seem to have eluded many who speak out on this subject, notably the President and—incredibly—Admiral Stansfield Turner.

First, the term "retired" as applied to such officers is imprecise and misleading. A military officer who finds himself in this status did not, in the majority of cases, arrive there voluntarily.

The military service is, quite rightly, a young man's game, and there are strict limitations imposed by Congress on the number of officers who can be retained on active duty in each grade. From a total of over 60,000 naval officers on active duty, the numbers dwindle in the higher grades to about 50 flag officers. Except for those selected to be one of these 50, everyone else of comparable longevity has to go. In the Navy, it's "up or out"—there are no long-term, paper-pushing jobs wherein one can sit collecting pay (and obstructing progress) until some magical age is attained. A naval officer either gets promoted when he is due, or he goes.

Due to proportionately greater grade restrictions in the grades of captain (bird colonel) and rear admiral (two-star), most compulsory severances occur to commanders not selected for captain, and to captains not selected for rear admiral.

Their non-selection is not indicative of egregious incompetence, since no incompetent would have made it to the selection point; it is primarily due to the statutory restrictions on numbers who may be selected. There may, for example, be a group of 400

military and managerial geniuses available for selection; nevertheless, only 50 of them can be selected for flag rank—the rest have to go.

By this point in their lives, these gents have spent over 20 years in the Navy and are in their mid-40s. They are energetic and accomplishment oriented, and they are on the street, many without a marketable skill other than a knowledge of military affairs and the ability to manage and make decisions. Their general competence is indicated by the large numbers who are successful in second careers, even in the face of economic and social prejudice.

It is, I assume, in recognition of the possibility of early and involuntary career termination that Congress saw fit to provide a guaranteed income to severed officers. Partly, this income is designed to offset relatively low active-duty pay over the years and partly as a retainer, because the officer is subject to immediate recall to active duty if he is needed.

Whether military officers' services are worth such pay is, of course, for Congress to decide—as well as far for the officer. If he perceives it as a ripoff, he will from economic necessity forego the service early on and won't stay around to be possibly non-selected at age 45.

Or, as now seems likely, the military officer will emulate his fellow citizens, form a political power bloc, and simply demand the wages he feels he deserves. If either of these eventualities come to pass, the service, and the country, will be the worse for it.

Second, in the present context, the important thing about so-called "retired pay" is that it has been earned fairly and squarely. The amount and the terms were part of the deal between the officer and the government from the outset—a deal made with full public knowledge and a deal in which the severed officer fulfilled his part under constant scrutiny and examination. Entitlement to this pay should in justice have absolutely no effect on an officer's subsequent employment, whether with the government or in the private sector. His fitness for a job is in no way affected by his financial status, whether it is based on previously invested income or its equivalent. To characterize such earned pay as vaguely dishonest and somehow a clever fleecing of the public is manifestly unjust.

Yet the President himself unfairly stigmatizes retired officers by implying that they are somehow hoodwinking the good people of America by "double-dipping, triple-dipping, sometimes quadruple-dipping"—into the public till, one is encouraged to assume. This interpretation of the President's attitude is no fantasy, for many years retired officers, regardless of their skills and energy, have been discouraged from accepting federal employment by mandatory, legislated salary penalties based not on the abilities of the applicant but on something else.

Worse, Admiral Stansfield Turner, himself an active-duty naval officer who certainly understands better than I the issues involved, has reportedly announced that in the future he will allow no retired military officer to be hired by the CIA. Not even, one must suppose, if it turns out that the only living expert on a certain facet of intelligence information happens to be a retired officer. Hoist then by his own petard, Admiral Turner would be forced to acquire the services of the retiree-expert not by normal means, but by recalling him to active duty and ordering him to work at CIA. Very clever, and very economical.

Speaking only for myself, I resent having my honestly earned retired pay referred to by anybody—and especially by the Commander-in-Chief—as “dipping.” It ill-becomes the members of Congress and the Executive to

E 4022

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

June 23, 1977

disparage the earnings of anyone whose salary is a result of their own lawmaking. In a society where competence is penalized, whether for reasons of race or sex or former occupation, the drones will inevitably rise to the top.

P. M. PRESTON,
Commander, U.S.N. (Ret.).
Springfield, Va.

TO ESTABLISH A SELECT COMMITTEE ON POPULATION

HON. HELEN S. MEYNER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1977

Mrs. MEYNER. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this Congress, I had the pleasure of joining many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in the cosponsorship of a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Population. That resolution showed our commitment to addressing the critical problems surrounding population growth. Today, I have the privilege of joining our distinguished colleague, Mr. SCHUEY, in cosponsoring a resolution calling for the development and implementation of a national policy to stabilize the U.S. population by voluntary means. The introduction of this resolution coincides with the release of zero-population growth's recommendations for a national population policy. I have endorsed the aims of ZPG and I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this important program. I am submitting for the benefit of my colleagues and my constituents my statement in support of the concepts embodied in ZPG's recommendations.

The article follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN
HELEN S. MEYNER

I support the aims of Zero Population Growth.

Increasing population is a vital concern for every country in the world, and it is a problem we must begin to deal with immediately.

The reasons ought to be obvious. A cursory examination of available data reflects trends and developments that should awaken anyone to the reality of the problem and the necessity for quick action to respond to it.

This is a finite world. The demand for limited resources continues to rise, and unless we manage to curb the present rate of growth, we will be forced to radically alter our lifestyles. In 1951 the United Nations projected that the 1980 world population would be 3.638 billion. We reached that population in 1970. Twenty-five years ago, only eight nations imported more than one million tons of grain annually. Today, thirty-one nations do so. World food production is failing to keep pace with world population.

Food production is not the sole item for concern. The pressures of a burgeoning population on the free nations of the world read like a new "Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse"—increased unemployment, inflation, rising taxes, and overall economic instability. Clearly, this alone should prompt lawmakers and the law-abiding to work for the implementation of ZPG's goals.

There has been some action in the past on the part of the U.S. Congress to work for population growth control, but these initiatives have had limited effect.

In 1970 the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act was made into law (P.L. 91-572) and in 1972, the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future recommended that a Congressional committee on population growth be created. Only last January, a number of us in the House of Representatives sponsored a bill (H.R. 70) calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on Population.

Still, the concrete results are few, and a national population policy is all but absent.

There are, obviously, many problems inherent in developing a policy—ethical and practical—but these problems simply must be overcome. Indeed, they have to be overcome soon if we're even going to have a chance at structuring long-term goals. That's why I'm glad to do what I can to help ZPG in its efforts to control immigration sensibly, and to limit population growth through education and family-planning service. We must all work hard to attain these goals, for in the end, each and every one of us will be affected by the outcome.

THE BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA: A UNIQUE WILDERNESS' UNCERTAIN FATE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1977

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the least concrete, but most important, considerations that must be weighed in deciding the fate of the boundary waters canoe area in northern Minnesota is the need to set aside areas in which people can experience the solitude and tranquility of a natural setting undisturbed by human manipulation. The national wilderness preservation system was established to protect areas in which "the Earth and its community of life retains its primeval character and where the imprint of man's work is substantially unnoticeable." In these areas, one might observe nature's community as it was before humans entered the balance.

Margot Hornblower of the Washington Post recently traveled to the BWCA in an attempt to capture the flavor of the controversies that have surrounded the area since enactment of the 1964 Wilderness Act. She filed two articles; both draw attention to the basic struggle between the "wilderness ethic" and the feeling that multiple economic and recreational uses best serve the interests of the majority of the people. One hand, she records the strong anti-wilderness feelings of many local residents. On the other hand, she quotes two of the most eloquent spokesmen for wilderness preservation, Miron Heinzelman and Sigurd Olsen. Heinzelman, a retired forester, observes:

People who live in an urban society have no idea how drastically man has changed the world. We are just beginning to understand life systems—from plants to man. We ought not to destroy the last remnants of the natural world until we know more about it.

Olsen, a writer, says:

The average urbanite thinks wilderness is a place to go fishing. But once you've been there a few days, you start noticing the sunsets and the calling of the loons.

A certain calm descends on you.

The preservation of wilderness is more than rocks, trees, beautiful lakes and rivers—it's the salvation of the human soul. It satisfies our hunger to experience the primitive, the natural world.

It is all too easy to lose sight of these values when confronted with a problem as complex and long standing as the fate of the boundary waters. The Hornblower articles help keep these values in perspective. I commend them to my colleagues' attention:

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1977]
FATE OF A WILDERNESS ABOUT To Be DETERMINED

(By Margot Hornblower)

ELY, MINN.—In these wild border lands of the north country, the territorial imperative is the law. Wolves, bears, even migratory birds, fiercely defend their turf from outsiders.

Now man, a relative newcomer, has entered the primeval struggle. Though encumbered by courts and legislatures, he, too, is staking out competing claims to the wilderness.

The territory in question is a million acres of northern Minnesota called the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. The largest federally protected wilderness east of the Rockies, it is a picture-postcard land of pine forests where urban environmentalists can escape the mechanized world.

But in small towns like Ely, the economy depends on mining and logging. Long winter boredom is relieved by snowmobiles. Summer power boating to trout streams is considered a constitutional right. So citizens here claim environmentalists are out to destroy their way of life by creating a "rich man's preserve" in their own back yard.

Thus the struggle over the territory is a conflict of class, of geography, of culture and philosophy which goes to the heart of the environmental movement.

After five years of court battles between the environmentalists, recreation groups and commercial interests, the fate of this unique wilderness is about to be determined in Congress. Hearings will be held shortly on competing bills sponsored by two Minnesota Democrats.

Rep. James L. Oberstar, who represents northeastern Minnesota, including the wilderness area, would allow logging, motorboats and snowmobiles in 40 per cent of the area.

Rep. Donald M. Fraser of Minneapolis, 200 miles downstate, backed by 50 cosponsors, would allow access only to backpackers and canoeists.

The conflict has galvanized such national environmental groups as the Sierra Club, National Wildlife Federation and Izaak Walton League, which say the Oberstar bill would set a dangerous precedent.

The leader of the environmental coalition, Friends of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, is Miron Heinzelman, 57, a retired scientist who specialized in forest ecology. A mild-mannered man with single-minded dedication, Heinzelman is now a full-time activist.

"People who live in an urban society have no idea how drastically man has changed the world," Heinzelman said, adding that wilderness—land undisturbed by timbering, farming, roads or human settlement—is a living laboratory.

"We're just beginning to understand life systems—from plants to man. We ought not to destroy the last remnants of the natural world until we know more about it."

Sigurd Olsen, 78, a writer who lives in Ely, has also joined the Boundary Waters fight. "The average urbanite thinks wilderness is a place to go fishing," Olsen said. "But once